

REMARKS

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that Claims 66-69 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, Applicants are amending independent Claims 1, 36, 48 and 54 to include all of the features of dependent Claims 66-69, respectively (which are all directly dependent on the independent claims) and recite "wherein the second surface of the substrate has a single spherical configuration which acts as a single lens."

Claims 66-69 are being canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Applicants have the following response to the rejections in the Office Action.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103

Claims 1, 3, 32, 34, 35, 48-50, 52 and 53

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 1, 3, 32, 34, 35, 48-50, 52 and 53 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahara (US 6,219,113) in view of Nishio et al. (US 6,046,547) in further view of Nishiguchi (US 6,046,787). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, as explained above, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending independent Claims 1 and 48 to include the features of dependent Claims 66 and 68, respectively. As the Examiner has stated that the subject matter of Claims 66 and 68 is not disclosed in the cited references, amended Claims 1 and 48 are also not disclosed by the cited references of Takahara, Nishio and Nishiguchi.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 36-38, 40, 41, 54-56, 58 and 59

The Examiner also rejects Claims 36-38, 40, 41, 56-56, 58 and 59 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahara, in view of Nishio et al., in further view of Hamada (US 6,114,715), and in still further view of Nishiguchi. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, as explained above, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending independent Claims 36 and 54 to include the features of dependent Claims 67 and 69, respectively. As the Examiner has stated that the subject matter of Claims 67 and 69 is not disclosed in the cited references, amended Claims 36 and 54 are also not disclosed by the cited references of Takahara, Nishio, Hamada and Nishiguchi.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicants are submitting an information disclosure statement (IDS) herewith. It is respectfully requested that this IDS be entered and considered prior to the issuance of any further action on this application.

This IDS is being submitted to cite references cited against counterpart Japanese patent application 2000-037421 in an Office Action dated August 18, 2009. In the Japanese Office Action, it appears that the examiner is asserting that JP11-65471 and JP11-84425 teach an EL display device and a liquid crystal display device, and that JP10-260398 teaches a feature that a second surface is made of a convex lens for improving visibility, referring to Fig. 8 in the reference. In the Japanese office action, the examiner rejects the claims and contends that it was easy to conceive the claimed

invention by making a second surface of a display device of JP11-65471 and JP11-84425 as a convex lens of JP10-260398.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any fee should be due for this amendment and/or IDS, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Date: October 29, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark J. Murphy/

Mark J. Murphy

Registration No. 34,225

COOK ALEX Ltd.
200 West Adams Street
Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500

Customer No. 26568